

REMARKS

1. Present Status of Patent Application

In response to the non-final Office Action dated July 17, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

2. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 and 12-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Limsico* (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,952) in view of *Ackroff* (U.S. Patent No. 5,105,438) in further view of *Kadooka* (U.S. Patent No. 5,606,663). Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* in further view of *Kadooka* in further view of *Goldberg* (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,890).

a. Independent Claim 1

As recited in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

A password management system, comprising:
graphical user interface logic residing on a first computer system operable to receive a current password from a user, prompt the user to determine whether the user desires to change the current password, and responsive to the user response receive a new password;

password confirmation logic residing on the first computer system operable to confirm the current password associated with the user on a switched access remote test system residing on a second computer system remote from the first computer system;

password administration logic residing on the first computer system, responsive to the password confirmation logic and the graphical user interface, operable to receive the new password and to change the current password on the switched access remote test system; and

expiration logic residing on the first computer system operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* in further view of *Kadooka* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “expiration logic residing on the first computer system operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration,” as recited in claim 1.

For instance, *Limsico* describes a password changing routine that provides a graphic user interface. In response to receiving a request from a host machine to change a password, the routine sends a user’s new password as entered in a password changer window 100. See col. 5, lines 3-12 and col. 10, lines 7-18. *Limsico* describes that a host system tracks an expiration date for a user’s password and does not disclose that the password changing routine is capable of performing this function. Rather, the password changing routine relays messages and prompts generated by the host system. For at least this reason, *Limsico* fails to teach or suggest “expiration logic residing on the first computer system operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, *Limsico* fails to disclose that the local machine 310 has expiration logic operable to determine if a current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto a remote machine 320.

Further, *Ackroff* describes an Intelligent Network Channeling Terminating Equipment device that can measure the frequency and level of signals that are sent from a remote location such as from a Switched Access Remote Test System. See col. 5, lines 1-6. *Ackroff* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Limsico* for at least the reason that *Ackroff* does not teach or suggest “expiration logic residing on the first computer system operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the

current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration,” as recited in claim 1.

Kadooka also describes a password updating system where a computer system which requires a password has a comparator unit 2, period setting unit 3, hysteresis memory unit 4, update processing unit 5, and input unit 6 residing with the computer system. For example, the period setting unit 3, update processing unit 5, and input unit 6 retrieve information in or store information to the hysteresis memory unit 4 on the same computer system. As such, *Kadooka* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Limsico* and *Ackroff* for at least the reason that *Kadooka* fails to teach or suggest “expiration logic residing on the first computer system operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, *Kadooka* fails to disclose that a first computer has expiration logic operable to determine if a current password for a system is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto a second computer where the system resides.

Each of the aforementioned cited references fails to teach or suggest features alleged in the Office Action. Other references in the proposed combination fail to remedy the deficiencies of the individual references. Therefore, the proposed combination of references does not disclose all of the features of claim 1. One should not show obviousness based on a combination of references if claimed features are not disclosed by any of the individual references of the proposed combination. Further, Applicant submits that the claimed features would not be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. As such, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* in further view of *Kadooka* has not been made, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, in response to prior arguments, it states that “*Kadooka* teaches expiration logic residing on a first computer (*Limsico*’s local machine) system operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on a second computer

system (Limsico's remote machine) and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration (see figure 4a)." Page 2. However, as explained above, both *Kadooka* and *Limsico* describe that a host computer of a password protected computer system has password routines that reside on the host computer having the password protected computer system. These password routines do not reside on a second computer. Therefore, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1.

b. Dependent Claims 2-11

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 2-11 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Independent Claim 12

As recited in independent claim 12, Applicant claims:

A method of managing passwords, comprising:
providing a user with a graphical user interface residing on a first computer system;
receiving a current password from the user via the graphical user interface for a switched access remote test system residing on a second computer system remote from the first computer system;
determining at the first computer system if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system;
prompting the user on whether to change the current password;
receiving a new password from the user responsive to the user response to the prompting;
confirming the current password with the switched access remote test system; and
requesting that the switched access remote test system change the password responsive to the user response to the prompting.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 12 is allowable for at least the reason that *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* in further view of *Kadooka* does not disclose, teach,

or suggest at least “determining at the first computer system if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system,” as recited in claim 12.

For example, *Limsico* describes a password changing routine that provides a graphic user interface. In response to receiving a request from a host machine to change a password, the routine sends a user’s new password as entered in a password changer window 100. See col. 5, lines 3-12 and col. 10, lines 7-18. *Limsico* describes that a host system tracks an expiration date for a user’s password and does not disclose that the password changing routine is capable of performing this function. Rather, the password changing routine relays messages and prompts generated by the host system. For at least this reason, *Limsico* fails to teach or suggest “determining at the first computer system if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system,” as recited in claim 12. Accordingly, *Limsico* fails to disclose that the local machine 310 has expiration logic operable to determine if a current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto a remote machine 320.

Further, *Ackroff* describes an Intelligent Network Channeling Terminating Equipment device that can measure the frequency and level of signals that are sent from a remote location such as from a Switched Access Remote Test System. See col. 5, lines 1-6. *Ackroff* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Limsico* for at least the reason that *Ackroff* does not teach or suggest “determining at the first computer system if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system,” as recited in claim 12.

Kadooka also describes a password updating system where a computer system which requires a password has a comparator unit 2, period setting unit 3, hysteresis memory unit 4, update processing unit 5, and input unit 6 residing with the computer system. For example, the period setting unit 3, update processing unit 5, and input unit 6 retrieve information in or store information to the hysteresis memory unit 4 on the same computer system. As such, *Kadooka* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Limsico* and *Ackroff* for at least the reason that *Kadooka* fails to teach or suggest “determining at the first computer system if the current password is approaching its

expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system,” as recited in claim 12. Accordingly, *Kadooka* fails to disclose that a first computer has expiration logic operable to determine if a current password for a system is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto a second computer where the system resides.

Each of the aforementioned cited references fails to teach or suggest features alleged in the Office Action. Other references in the proposed combination fail to remedy the deficiencies of the individual references. Therefore, the proposed combination of references does not disclose all of the features of claim 12. One should not show obviousness based on a combination of references if claimed features are not disclosed by any of the individual references of the proposed combination. Further, Applicant submits that the claimed features would not be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. As such, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* in further view of *Kadooka* has not been made, and the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, in response to prior arguments, it states that “*Kadooka* teaches expiration logic residing on a first computer (*Limsico*’s local machine) system operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on a second computer system (*Limsico*’s remote machine) and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration (see figure 4a).” Page 3. However, as explained above, both *Kadooka* and *Limsico* describe that a host computer of a password protected computer system has password routines that reside on the host computer having the password protected computer system. These password routines do not reside on a second computer. Therefore, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 12.

d. Dependent Claims 13-20

For at least the reasons given above, claim 12 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 13-20 depend from claim 12 and recite additional features, claims 13-20 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

e. Independent Claim 21

As recited in independent claim 21, Applicant claims:

A computer readable medium having a program for managing passwords, the program operable to perform:

providing a user with a graphical user interface residing on a first computer system;

receiving a current password from the user via the graphical user interface for a switched access remote test system residing on a second computer system remote from the first computer system;

prompting the user on whether to change the current password;

determining at the first computer system if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system;

prompting the user on whether to change the current password;

receiving a new password from the user responsive to the user response to the prompting; confirming the current password with the switched access remote test system;

requesting that the switched access remote test system change the password responsive to the user response to the prompting.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reason that *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* in further view of *Kadooka* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “determining at the first computer system if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system,” as recited in claim 21.

For instance, *Limsico* describes a password changing routine that provides a graphic user interface. In response to receiving a request from a host machine to change a password, the routine sends a user’s new password as entered in a password changer window 100. See col. 5, lines 3-12 and col. 10, lines 7-18. *Limsico* describes that a host system tracks an expiration date for a user’s password and does not

disclose that the password changing routine is capable of performing this function. Rather, the password changing routine relays messages and prompts generated by the host system. For at least this reason, *Limsico* fails to teach or suggest “determining at the first computer system if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system,” as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, *Limsico* fails to disclose that the local machine 310 has expiration logic operable to determine if a current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto a remote machine 320.

Further, *Ackroff* describes an Intelligent Network Channeling Terminating Equipment device that can measure the frequency and level of signals that are sent from a remote location such as from a Switched Access Remote Test System. See col. 5, lines 1-6. *Ackroff* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Limsico* for at least the reason that *Ackroff* does not teach or suggest “determining at the first computer system if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system,” as recited in claim 21.

Kadooka also describes a password updating system where a computer system which requires a password has a comparator unit 2, period setting unit 3, hysteresis memory unit 4, update processing unit 5, and input unit 6 residing with the computer system. For example, the period setting unit 3, update processing unit 5, and input unit 6 retrieve information in or store information to the hysteresis memory unit 4 on the same computer system. As such, *Kadooka* is inadequate to remedy the deficiencies of *Limsico* and *Ackroff* for at least the reason that *Kadooka* fails to teach or suggest “determining at the first computer system if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on the second computer system,” as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, *Kadooka* fails to disclose that a first computer has expiration logic operable to determine if a current password for a system is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto a second computer where the system resides.

Each of the aforementioned cited references fail to teach or suggest features alleged in the Office Action. Other references in the proposed combination fail to remedy the deficiencies of the individual references. Therefore, the proposed

combination of references does not disclose all of the features of claim 21. One should not show obviousness based on a combination of references if claimed features are not disclosed by any of the individual references of the proposed combination. Further, Applicant submits that the claimed features would not be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art. As such, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Limsico* in view of *Ackroff* in further view of *Kadooka* has not been made, and the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, in response to prior arguments, it states that “Kadooka teaches expiration logic residing on a first computer (Limsico’s local machine) system operable to determine if the current password is approaching its expiration prior to logging onto the switched access remote test system residing on a second computer system (Limsico’s remote machine) and is operable to cause the user to be prompted to change the current password if the current password is determined to be approaching its expiration (see figure 4a).” Page 3. However, as explained above, both *Kadooka* and *Limsico* describe that a host computer of a password protected computer system has password routines that reside on the host computer having the password computer system. These password routines do not reside on a second computer. Therefore, the proposed combination does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 21.

f. Dependent Claims 22-29

For at least the reasons given above, claim 21 is allowable over the cited art of record. Since claims 22-29 depend from claim 21 and recite additional features, claims 22-29 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for at least the specific and particular reason that the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/CWG/

Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500